

MM DOCKET NO. 98-35

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 30 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: frank brown <frog@halcyon.com>  
To: A4.A4 (SSEGAL)  
Date: 3/27/98 5:00pm  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

frank brown (frog@halcyon.com) writes:

I recently learned there is pending legislation which would do away with the current prohibition of a single company owning multiple media outlets in a single community; i.e. a tv station and a major daily newspaper serving the same market.

I'm sending this mail to express my disapproval of such a move. This would increase the monopolization of "news" as well as make it easier to slant discussion on community issues. The potential for censorship would also be increased as I see it.

Please consider opposing any moves to remove the aforementioned prohibition.

Thank you for your attention.

Frank Brown  
1402 N. 46th  
Seattle, WA 98103

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 209.63.94.1  
Remote IP address: 209.63.94.1

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

MM Docket 98-55

RECEIVED

MAR 30 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Russ Moritz <dilworth@netw.com>  
To: A4.A4 (SSEGAL)  
Date: 3/28/98 12:56pm  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Russ Moritz (dilworth@netw.com) writes:

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 lifted restrictions on media ownership. Touted as a "pro-competition" move, the act allowed for the mergers and increased concentration that we see in today's media world.

The Telecom Act also required the Federal Communications Commission to consider changing a whole range of rules-including the rule that forbids a company from owning a TV station and a newspaper in the same market. The FCC has always had the power to waive the rule in specific cases, and they've done so-for Rupert Murdoch in New York city, for example.

Now Republicans in Congress want this cross-ownership rule scrapped entirely, and they've put forward legislation that will do just that. They've got the support of the National Association of Broadcasters and the Newspaper Association of America who say that given the wealth of news available to people, there's no need to worry about the loss of diversity implied in letting one company control a town's TV news and what may be their only daily.

I say that's just more self-serving bullshit from media monopolies who want to control the who, what, why, when and where of free speech. Don't listen to the Congressional bagmen for the media: maintain rules against newspaper-TV cross ownership.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 204.227.172.233  
Remote IP address: 204.227.172.233

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

mm docket 98-35

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Charles D. Johnson, M.D. ret. <charlesj@student.umass.edu>  
To: A4.A4(SSEGAL)  
Date: 3/28/98 8:48pm  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAR 30 1998

Charles D. Johnson, M.D. (ret.) (charlesj@student.umass.edu) writes  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I've been around too long to be fooled by the idea that allowing one person or corporation to own both television and the printed media in an area will increase news coverage, or increase competition. BIG is not better, it's just BIGGER, which generally means slower, less aware, more dull, and less fun. I urge you to not allow cross ownership of Television and Newspapers in the same area.

Sincerely,

Charles D. Johnson, M.D. (ret.)

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 128.119.179.34  
Remote IP address: 128.119.179.34

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MM Docket 98-35

RECEIVED

From: Jary Stavely <jstavely@mcn.org>  
To: A4.A4 (SSEGAL)  
Date: 3/28/98 1:58am  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

MAR 30 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Jary Stavely (jstavely@mcn.org) writes:

I, for one, am somewhat skeptical of the benefits ordinary Americans will reap from the Telecom Act of 1996. I am more concerned, however, about new legislation which is being proposed to universally allow media monopolies in local market areas. It's bad enough that newspaper competition is a thing of the past. Please do not let newspaper conglomerates to also control TV markets in the same city of newspaper ownership. While the quality of phone service may be little affected by the new "competition" which, as you say, is interrupting our evening meals, lowering our long distance charges, and increasing our rates for basic service, the control of the media by the current giants of "free" enterprise does and will have a decided effect on the quality of information ordinary citizens need in order to make truly informed decisions in guiding our representatives at all levels of government. Please do not allow unrestricted media monopolies. I would like to see you go the other way and restrict the current waiver policy which allows media monopolies on a city by city basis. Thanks for your attention.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 204.189.12.206  
Remote IP address: 204.189.12.206

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MM Docket NO 98-35

RECEIVED

From: Elizabeth T. Ryan <etr@spectra.net>  
To: A4.A4 (SSEGAL)  
Date: 3/27/98 8:28pm  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

MAR 30 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Elizabeth T. Ryan (etr@spectra.net) writes:

Allowing the ownership of a newspaper and a TV station in the same market does not increase competition, in my opinion.  
I do not want to have only one source for my news, which is what allowing the above would do.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 204.177.130.172  
Remote IP address: 204.177.130.172

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2